UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

MICHAEL	. MARR.
---------	---------

Plaintiff, Case No. 13-13668

Hon. Marianne O. Battani

٧.

Magistrate Judge Paul J. Komives

RAYMOND BOOKER and CHARLES SINCLAIR,

Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER ADOPTING IN PART MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff Michael Marr filed this action on August 27, 2013. On March 19, 2014, the Court referred this matter to Magistrate Judge Paul J. Komives for all pretrial matters. At the time of the referral, several motions were pending.

In his Report and Recommendation, dated April 30, 2014, Magistrate Judge Komives recommended that Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction be denied without prejudice and that Defendant Raymond Booker's Motion to Revoke Plaintiff's In Forma Pauperis Status be denied. Magistrate Judge Komives also recommended that the Court order Plaintiff to file an amended complaint that superceded his August 27, 2013, October 17, 2013, and October 23, 2013, complaints. The Magistrate Judge informed the parties that objections to the Report and Recommendation must be filed within fourteen days of service and that a party's failure to file objections would waive any further right of appeal. (Doc. No. 22 at 14).

2:13-cv-13668-MOB-PTM Doc # 25 Filed 06/25/14 Pg 2 of 3 Pg ID 154

Neither party objected to the recommendations relative to the two pending motions,

and, therefore, the parties have waived their right to review and appeal of the disposition

of those two motions. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's

recommendations and **DENIES WITHOUT PREJUDICE** Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary

Injunction and **DENIES** Defendant's Motion to Revoke Plaintiff's In Forma Pauperis Status

and Dismiss this Action.

Plaintiff does object to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation that he file an

amended complaint to clarify which claims are being pursued against which Defendants.

The Court has reviewed the filings, including de novo review of Plaintiff's objection to this

recommendation. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Although the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge's characterization and analysis

of the three complaints filed in this action, any confusion that arises from the disconnect

between the three complaints is alleviated by Plaintiff's subsequent request that his

October 23, 2013, complaint be dismissed.

Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** the October 23, 2013, complaint.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the United States Marshal shall effect service of

the October 17, 2013, Complaint (Doc. No. 9) upon Defendant Charles Sinclair.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: June 25, 2014

s/Marianne O. Battani

MARIANNE O. BATTANI

United States District Judge

2

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing Order was served upon counsel of record via the Court's ECF System to their respective email addresses or First Class U.S. mail to the non-ECF participants on June 25, 2014.

s/ Kay Doaks Case Manager